Amendment to the Drawings

Please replace Figs. 4-10 with the enclosed 7 replacement sheets illustrating

Figs. 4-10.

REMARKS

These remarks are made responsive to the non-final office action mailed May 11, 2007. Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 16, 21, 26, 27 and 33 have been amended to include that "each strip is a long and narrow piece of the image." Claims 2-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 28-32 remain unamended.

Drawings

Replacement sheets for Figures 4-10 are included herein that will hopefully will address the Examiner's concerns about appropriate contrast. No new matter has been added. However, Applicants respectfully assert that the drawings together with the written description do clearly describe Applicants invention as claimed. For example, Figure 4 as originally filed illustrates the strips 404 and 406 of the two images 400 and 402. Strips 504 and 506 are representative are representative examples of "an overlap area of best match." (See p. 10 line 27-28 of Applicants's disclosure.) It is respectfully requested that the drawings objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-8, 14, 15, and 21-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Peterson (US 6,411,742).

Claims 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson (US 6,411,742) in combination with Xiong (US 6,549,651).

Neither of Peterson or Xiong teach or suggest the "dividing the two images into strips <u>wherein each strip is a long and narrow piece of the image</u>" as recited in claim 1. As mentioned above, the other independent claims 16, 26, 27 and 33 have been amended to also include that a "strip is a long and narrow piece of the image," so the arguments with respect to claim 1 are also applicable to claims 16, 26, 27 and 33. As illustrated in Figure 4 of Applicants' disclosure, each of the images is divided into strips illustrated as long and narrow pieces of each image. Furthermore, the plain meaning of the word "strip" is that it is a long and narrow piece typically of uniform width. (*See* (1) strip. (n.d.). Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1). Retrieved November 13, 2007, from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/strip "a narrow piece, comparatively long and usually of uniform width: a strip of cloth,

metal, land, etc.") (*See also* (2) strip. (n.d.). The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition. Retrieved November 13, 2007, from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/strip "A long narrow piece, usually of uniform width: a strip of paper; strips of beef.")

Additionally, neither of Peterson or Xiong along or in combination teach "selecting a strip of uniform width in each of the two images where the two images overlap each other" and "determining a line through the overlapping strips where the differences between the overlapping strips are minimized."

As shown in its Figure 4, Peterson fits different images containing portions of the same subject matter onto a clean canvas and fits the pieces together by masking those portions not to be visible. For example, see col. 6, lines 31 through 55 in its discussion of Figure 4:

> "Referring to FIG. 4, the image blender starts with a clean background, known as a canvas 120, onto which it draws the first image 18a to produce an image 120a, after which the image blender draws the visible portion 121b of the second image 18b' onto the canvas 120 to produce the image 120b. In drawing the second image, the image blender computes the pixel values of the image 120b according to the formula: ......
> As can be seen from the formula above, where the pixel value of the second image has a value of "1", the second image completely obstructs the first image and where the pixel value of the second image has a value of "0", the first image is completely visible through the second image."

This overlaying of images approach is quite different from the claimed strip approach. These portions (e.g. 121c, 121d) are not uniform in size and shape but are dependent in size and shape on the location of the particular objects (e.g. the door) are located in the different images. The size and shape of the portions is not standardized as with the use of strips provides for the claimed invention.

Xiong also takes this canvas approach of overlaying images to find points of intersections so that the overlapping regions are not a standard shape. For example, see the overlapping images 1002 and 1004 of Figure 10. (See also, col. 14, lines 53-59). The overlapped region is not formed from standardized in size and shape regions of the images, but is again dependent on the geometry of the common elements in the images when captured fitting into a canvas.

The arguments with respect to claims 1, 16, 21, 26, 27 and 33 are applicable to their respective dependent claims as well.

Conclusion

In light of the arguments presented above, the pending claims as amended are in condition for allowance, and applicants respectfully request a prompt notice of allowance.

Date: *Nov. 13, 2007*

Respectfully Submitted on Behalf of Applicant

D. Amnon Silverstein and Yining Deng

Eileen Lehmann

Eileen Lehmann
Registration No. 39,272
Hewlett-Packard Company
Mail Stop 1197
1501 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
650-857-7940 (telephone)
650-852-8063 (fax)